

REMARKS

Claims 4 and 15 are amended. Claims 9, 10, and 11 are hereby cancelled. Claims remaining in the application are 1-8, and 12-21.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,532,841 to Nakajima et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,424,844 to Koyanagi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Nakajima et al. '841 and Koyanagi et al. '844 patents fails to disclose all of the features of the Applicants' claim 1. The Nakajima et al. '841 disclosure describes facsimile apparatus with a plurality of free-standing image reading units such as scanners that read an image of a document and, through a wireless interface, communicate the image data to a central main controlling unit. Image recording units, such as printers can then obtain this data, again through wireless connection, in order to record the image data onto a recording medium. The only data interface shown between units is a wireless interface, termed a "radio communication line" in the Nakajima et al. '841 disclosure. The Koyanagi et al. '844 disclosure teaches a facsimile machine (21) that communicates with an information collecting unit (12) by means of a communication line that is described as an RS-232 or RS-422 interface (col. 5, lines 29-31).

Neither the Nakajima et al. '841 nor the Koyanagi et al. '844 disclosure teaches the following feature (shown italicized) that is cited in the Applicants' claim 1:

said first tether interface provides for power from said first scanning unit to said second scanning unit;

With respect to this feature, the system described by Nakajima et al. shows discrete image reading units (100a, 100b, 100c) each of which has an explicitly wireless communication connection to the main controlling unit (300). With such an arrangement, there is no motivation or suggestion to route a power connection in a tethered interface extending from one image reading unit to another. Instead, this system appears to be intentionally designed so that image reading units (100a, 100b, 100c) are independent of each other. This mutually independent and wireless arrangement is described by Nakajima et al. as

advantageous because it overcomes the problem of waiting that can occur if these image reading units are wired together in the conventional manner of facsimile machines. See, for example, Nakajima et al. '841 col. 1 lines 16-32 and lines 55-63.

The Koyanagi et al. '844 disclosure fails to remedy the deficiency of the Nakajima et al. '841 disclosure as it relates to any type of tethered power connection. The Office Action incorrectly states that such a tethered connection is described in Koyanagi et al. '844 col. 5 lines 20-30 and shown in Figures 2 and 3. However, as its "local area network 14" the Koyanagi et al. '844 disclosure describes only a communication line between the facsimile machine (21) and information collecting unit (12). Examples of possible communication lines given by Koyanagi et al. are RS232C or RS422. Both of these interfaces are suitable for the "local area network 14" that Koyanagi et al. describe and, in doing this, provide only signal-level voltages. As is well known to those skilled in the electronic communication arts, the RS232C or RS422 interfaces define data signal levels only. Neither RS232C or RS422 are capable of, nor intended for, providing operating power to a peripheral apparatus such as a scanner.

Therefore, it is submitted that, with respect to the feature in claim 1 and cited above for providing power from the first to the second scanning unit, neither the Nakajima et al. '841 nor the Koyanagi et al. '844 disclosures, taken either singly or in combination, suggest or motivate this feature.

With particular respect to claim 5, the Office Action states that Nakajima et al. '841 discloses that controller (150) of Figure 6 and signal processor (152) of Figure 6 contained in scanner (100) of Figure 5 handle data control and camera movement for first and second scanning units and that this is stated in col. 6 lines 53-56. This is not what is stated. Nakajima et al. '841 merely states that the controller (150) shown in detail in Figure 6 controls **its own** image reading unit (100). There is no indication that controller (150) controls any more than the single image reading unit (100) with which it is associated. There is a controller (150) for each image reading unit (100) in the Nakajima et al. '841 architecture. By way of contrast, the Applicants' claim 5 relates to unit control and image processing electronics in "said first scanning unit" that "handles data control and camera movement for both said first scanning unit and said second scanning unit". This is shown in the Applicants' Figure 10, for separate sheet fed

scanner 11 that controls platen scanner 13. If the Nakajima et al. '841 disclosure were to show this type of arrangement, controller (150) would need to be shown serving multiple image reading units (100), which is clearly not the case.

The Applicants respectfully point out that apparently no grounds of rejection are given in the Office Action for claims 14, 15, and 16. The Office Action should state grounds of rejection for each rejected claim (MPEP 707.07(d)).

Dependent claims 2-8 and 12-21 are dependent on claim 1 and are also rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,532,841 to Nakajima et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,424,844 to Koyanagi et al. As claim 1 can be distinguished from the prior art references cited, rejections to its dependent claims are similarly traversed.

CONCLUSION

Dependent claims not specifically addressed add additional limitations to the independent claims, which have been distinguished from the prior art and are therefore also patentable.

In conclusion, none of the prior art cited by the Office Action discloses the limitations of the claims of the present invention, either individually or in combination. Therefore, it is believed that the claims are allowable.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that additional modifications to the claims are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below for a telephone interview and Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Blish
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 29,134

Nelson A. Blish/tms
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2720
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.